



**Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family**

1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

A general meeting of the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC) was convened on December 6, 2018, at the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, 1700 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor Conference Room, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (19)	
Cindi Nannetti, Chair	James Molina
Helen Gándara	Navin Crump
James Beene	Alice Bustillo
Dennis Pickering	Donald Walker
Dorothy Wodraska	Earl Newton
Robert Thomas	Christina Schopen
Leslie Quinn	Joseph Grossman
Joseph Kelroy	Mindy Flannery
Vada Phelps	Maria Dodge
Heather Carter	
Staff/Guests Present (8)	Members Absent (11)
Melisha Bryant, Americorps Vista, GOYFF	Shawn Cox
Malcolm Hightower, Deputy Director, GOYFF	Jeff Hood
Livia Finman, MSW Intern, GOYFF	Jason Holmberg
Steve Selover, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Guadalupe Durazo
Katie Penkoff, Public Member	Tom Callahan
Sarah Murillo, Public Member	Robert Brutinel
Jennifer Ortiz, Administrative Office of the Courts	Jose Gonzales
Amy Stuart, Administrative Office of the Courts	Debra Olson
	Greg McKay
	Shaun Rieve
	Jane Kallal

Call to Order

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti**, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. with 19 members and 8 staff and guests present.

Introductions

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, requested a review of the September 6, 2018, meeting minutes.
 - **Mr. Joseph Grossman** motioned to accept the minutes as drafted.

- **Mr. Robert Thomas** seconded the motion.
- The motion passed with no dissenting votes.

Detention Screening Instrument (DSI)

- **Ms. Jennifer Ortiz**, Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts, provided an overview of the Detention Screening Tool (DSI), describing its purpose and function for screening juveniles for detention prior to their first court hearing.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated the tool is currently being utilized in six counties and is currently in the process of being validated.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked if the tool is being used in Maricopa County, and when would the judicial officer receive the information gathered by the DSI. **Ms. Ortiz** responded that when juveniles are arrested, the assessment is completed and they are given a score. This score helps to determine whether they will be detained or released to parents.
- **Ms. Heather Carter** referenced the category related to aggravating factors and asked whether the restrictions on sharing this information would make acquiring this data challenging. **Ms. Ortiz** stated that this information is self-reported, and police officers are not expected to conduct an in-depth investigation of the child's history at this point. **Ms. Ortiz** added that self-reporting data can also be cross-referenced with the probation officer or parents.
- **Ms. Maria Dodge** asked how assessment is used when there are multiple charges. **Ms. Ortiz** stated the most serious offense is used.
- **Mr. Dennis Pickering** asked why fire staring and animal cruelty was specified under aggravating factors. **Ms. Ortiz** advised that children who check this box are more likely to offend.
- **Mr. Pickering** asked for the rate of usage compliance by intake officers. **Ms. Ortiz** stated that usage compliance is 100 percent.
- **Mr. Pickering** asked about the use of overrides. **Ms. Ortiz** explained that the tool does not replace the judgement of the intake officer. She stated that the child may not score at or above the 12 point threshold but may still be detained based on other factors.
- **Ms. Leslie Quinn** asked the Chair for a presentation on outcome data once it is available. **Ms. Nannetti** agreed this would be of interest to the commission.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked whether data is collected related to youth who are released per the assessment results but re-offend or do not appear for court. **Ms. Ortiz** stated that data is being collected as part of the validation process. She agreed that it is important to understand why children are not appearing for their hearing, whether the fault lies with the youth or if it is due to barriers outside of the youth's control, such as transportation.

AZYAS Screening

- **Ms. Amy Stuart**, Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts, provided an overview of the Arizona Youth Assessment System (AZYAS), describing its purpose and function for assessing the risk and needs for juveniles on probation.
- **Ms. Stuart** provided background to describe how Arizona arrived at using the AZYAS, explaining that prior to its usage there was little standardization on which survey questions were important for assessing the needs of youth. In 2011, the state began to utilize a model developed and validated by the University of Cincinnati named the Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS) that predicts youth most and least likely to offend, assesses strengths as well as barriers, and addresses a combination of static and dynamic factors to "identify the youth's needs" and "assess progression and regression", respectively.
- **Ms. Stuart** described the training and certification process for staff and noted a key element for the tool is the level of consistency it provides, ensuring all youth are assessed in the same way to determine risk level. These risks levels are then used to determine which services and treatments are appropriate for the individual youth.

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked how often children are scored while in treatment. Ms. Stuart advised the tool uses a mandatory six-month reassessment. If there are significant changes in the child's life, it could be conducted prior to the six-month standard.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked what would contribute to a reduction versus an increased risk of recidivism. **Ms. Stuart** provided examples such as reduced substance usage, increased family engagement and pro-social support.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked whether it is possible to track recidivism over the long term and tie it back to the types of services that are provided to measure effectiveness. **Mr. Kelroy** responded there is currently work being done in collaboration between adult and juvenile corrections to develop a program checklist to evaluate outcomes. So far 12 workers have been trained to begin the residential programming evaluation.

Information Sharing Guide

- **Mr. Steve Selover** provided members a draft copy of the Information Sharing Guide for crossover youth practitioners.
- **Mr. Selover** advised that this guide is a revision to the original manual published in 2007, and that each agency referenced in the guide has provided input by their legal team to ensure the guidance within is appropriate and updated.
- **Mr. Selover** stated that the legal content within the guide is complete; however, the manual is still undergoing minor grammatical edits and the GOYFF communications team will update the design and branding of the document.
- **Mr. Pickering** referenced guidance in the document that states "the law is unclear". **Mr. Selover** stated that some sharing transactions are very complex and involve so many contingent factors that the recommendation is to have the user contact his or her agency's legal advisor.
- **Mr. Grossman** suggested the commission and Governor's Office focus on promoting the guide and updating it based on statutory and other rule changes, which could be made simpler by posting the guide online in digital format.
- **Ms. Carter** confirmed whether the document was properly vetted. **Mr. Selover** responded that all agencies represented in the manual have reviewed their sections and provided input to their satisfaction. **Mr. Selover** added that the agencies and staff who contributed are referenced in the document.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, requested a motion to approve the content within the guide as drafted pending minor grammatical edits and updated design.
 - **Mr. Grossman** moved to approve the Information Sharing Guide, which includes the legal guidance provided by the Arizona Attorney General's Office, the Department of Child Safety, the Arizona Department of Education, the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Department of Juvenile Corrections, with the stipulation that minor non-substantive changes will be made to correct grammatical errors and update the design for branding.
 - **Mr. Pickering** seconded the motion.
- The motion passed with no descending votes.
- **Ms. Carter** inquired when the document will be ready, noting that there are many constituents who are asking. **Mr. Selover** stated that, accounting for usual holiday season delays, it is hoped the document will be ready within six to eight weeks, considering it will take time to design and approve the final product.
- **Mr. Selover** also advised commission members to not distribute the draft they received in the meeting packet since it is not ready for practical use.

AJJC Committee Reports

DMC Committee

- **Ms. Helen Gándara** advised that the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Committee has been working on becoming a broader community-based work group and is drafting goals and objectives and considering which community members to invite to serve on the committee.

- **Ms. Gándara** added that one member of the committee, **Mr. Earl Newton**, attended the Coalition for Juvenile Justice National DMC Conference to gather information on DMC efforts conducted throughout the country. **Mr. Newton** stated that the conference provided a large amount of quality information and is looking forward to providing an overview to the committee.

Children's Justice Committee

- **Mr. James Molina** shared that the committee staged a training for children's justice coordinators funded by the Children's Justice Act grant on October 31. The training covered various topics including protocol updates, victim advocacy, and navigating confidentiality.
- **Mr. Molina** stated that nine attendees participated in the training, representing seven counties. He added that the overall feedback was positive.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, who presented at the meeting, advised that due to the success of the training, the committee will try to coordinate this event more consistently, perhaps annually or every two years.

Grants Committee

- **Ms. Dorothy Wodraska** explained that the Title II grant process was completed and referenced the handout listing the programs awarded.
- **Mr. Selover** advised that eight awards were made and one is pending certification of compliance with 8 USC 1733, which is a new special condition required by the Office of Justice Programs for local units of government funded under this grant.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked whether any applicants were denied funding. **Mr. Selover** responded that the four lowest-scoring applications were not funded.
- **Mr. Pickering** asked if the full commission voted on the recommended awards. **Mr. Selover** advised, due to the delay in the release of the solicitation, a vote by the full commission was not feasible and, therefore, the Grants Committee voted to support the awards recommended by the evaluation team. **Mr. Selover** added that all commissioners are invited to participate in the review process and/or the Grants Committee if they desire to have greater involvement in the competitive solicitation process.

Staff Updates

Title II Grant Orientation

- **Mr. Selover** advised that each awarded program sent two representatives to the orientation held December 4. The meeting included an overview of the programmatic and financial requirements for the grant. In addition, staff presented on various GOYFF resources and training opportunities, including Service Enterprise and AmeriCorps, human trafficking training, RX toolkit training and the Parents Commission funding opportunity.

JJDP Compliance Update

- **Mr. Selover** provided an update on the state's compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act core requirements. **Mr. Selover** advised that with approximately 85 percent of data collected, the rates for the DSO, Jail Removal and Separation requirements are far below the allowed thresholds established by OJJDP. While the current rates may increase pending the analysis of the remaining data, **Mr. Selover** anticipates Arizona will be in compliance for the fiscal year 2018 reporting period.
- **Mr. Selover** advised that a more in-depth presentation on the data and compliance violations for FY 2018 will be provided during a subsequent meeting.

Children's Justice Act Grant

- **Mr. Selover**, on behalf of **Rebecca Chesley**, GOYFF program administrator, advised that the renewal process for the current CJA sub-grantees' third year of funding is currently underway. **Mr. Selover** stated that **Ms. Chesley** will provide a status update of the process during the next meeting.

AJJC Crosswalk

- **Ms. Livia Finman** introduced herself as an intern from Arizona State University MSW program, and stated she is working with **Mr. Selover** on several juvenile justice related projects, including the AJJC Crosswalk.
- **Ms. Finman** described the Crosswalk as a tool to help commission members view the efforts of other workgroups established by the three branches of state government. She advised that once completed, the document will help the AJJC align efforts with other similar public bodies to enhance collaboration and reduce duplication of efforts.
- **Ms. Finman** stated she will provide a more descriptive overview of the tool at the February meeting.

Upcoming Meeting Dates

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to reference the list of upcoming meeting dates provided in their meeting packets to ensure they are added to their calendars.

Call to the Public

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, made a call to the public.
- **Dr. Katie Penkoff** from the Center for Coordinated Assistance to States described the OJJDP Core Requirements Training for the States conference that took place during the previous week. Dr. Penkoff advised that **Mr. Selover** was asked by OJJDP to participate in two training panels.

Adjournment

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, called for a motion to adjourn.
 - **Mr. Thomas** moved to adjourn the meeting
 - **Ms. Leslie Quinn** seconded the motion.
- Motion carried without dissent. Meeting adjourned at 11:03 AM.

Dated December 10, 2018
Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Submitted by Steve Selover
Program Administrator, GOYFF